DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 797 HE 017 520

AUTHOR Brown, Marilyn K.
TITLE In Search of a Fair Faculty Allocation Formula. AIR 1984 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE 7 May 84
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (24th, Fort Worth, TX, May 6-9, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Budgeting; *College Faculty; Decision Making; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Mathematical Formulas; *Research Methodology; *Resource Allocation; *Teacher Placement
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; University of Maryland College Park; Weighted Data

ABSTRACT

Several approaches to determining a new formula for the allocation of faculty positions (and associated salary and operating funds) are discussed. These approaches are: weighting schemes used at peer institutions, faculty workload measures, and use of a state funding formula. A survey was used to solicit data concerning weighting schemes used at peer institutions. These weights were then applied to the subject institution's credit hours. The literature on the development of faculty workload measures was also reviewed. The state board for higher education's funding formula was converted to a weighting scheme and applied to the institution's student credit hours. It is concluded that each method has advantages and disadvantages. Use of a faculty activity analysis or a cost study would entail the collection and analysis of a large amount of data with no guarantee that the results would be acceptable. While the use of peer weights would not require as much effort and resources for implemention, the selection of any set of weights would be arbitrary and thus subject to criticism. None of the formulas accounts for all the variables relevant to particular decisions. The process that is currently under way at the University of Maryland at College Park to adopt a new weighting scheme is discussed. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED246797

In Search of a Fair Faculty Allocation Formula

by

Marilyn K. Brown, Director
Office of Institutional Studies
University of Maryland at College Park

presented at

1984 AIR Forum
Fort Worth, Texas
May 7, 1984

HE 017 520

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This paper was presented at the Twenty-Fourth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Hyatt-Regency in Fort Worth, Texas, May 6-9, 1984. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum papers.

Daniel R. Coleman, Chairman
Forum Publication
Advisory Committee

IN SEARCH OF A FAIR FACULTY ALLOCATION FORMULA

Abstract

Recently, administrators of a state research university decided it was time to change the formula on which the allocation of faculty lines (and associated salary and operating funds) was based. The paper investigates several approaches to determining a new formula: (1) weighting schemes used at peer institutions, (2) faculty workload measures, and (3) use of a state funding formula. The pitfalls one encounters when using a formula to allocate positions and funds are also described.

All too frequently in higher education, we fail to examine our traditional methodologies even though our missions and the environment in which we operate change. It takes a bold administrator to suggest that policies which have existed "for years" should be studied and perhaps revised. Such is the case at the flagship campus of a major state research university.

Historically, the assignment of "lines", or faculty positions, was based, partially, on the number of weighted student credit hours (WSCH) produced by a department or division, and the resulting "faculty quotient" (FQ). Salary funds as well as operating funds followed the assignment of faculty lines. There are several problems with the current formula. It favors departments where large sections of introductory courses are taught and handicaps departments with a high concentration of laboratory work. Because of the slight differential in the weights, departments that teach only at the graduate level are also handicapped. As the pool of available resources shrinks and enrollment shifts among departments, colleges, and divisions, academic administrators are no longer content to "live with" the current formula.

Following the advice of Meisinger (1976) to find "objective" allocation rules, this paper investigates several approaches to determining a new formula: (1) weighting schemes used at peer institutions, (2) faculty workload measures, and (3) use of a state funding formula. A survey was used to solicit data concerning weighting schemes used at peer institutions. These weights were then applied to the subject institution's credit hours. The literature was reviewed on the development of faculty workload measures. Examples from the work of Bolton (1965), Eagleton (1977), Hilst and McFee (1975), Howell (1962), and Sexon (1967) are offered. The state board for higher education's funding formula was converted to a weighting scheme and applied to the institution's student credit hours.

The paper points out the pitfalls encountered in the use of a formula to allocate positions and funds. It also discusses the process that is currently under way on the campus as the Planning Council struggles to adopt a new weighting scheme.

An important process in the development of a university's budget is the allocation of faculty "lines" or positions. In a state-supported university, the number of lines budgeted by the state is usually derived from application of some formula based on productivity measures, i.e. student credit hours taught, degrees granted, headcount enrollment, etc. Frequently, the state will not support the total number of faculty positions "earned" by the institution, but it is much more likely to cut positions when workload measures fail to support them.

Within the university there is a continuing problem of allocating positions equitably among units. Since the popularity of majors ebbs and flows, it is difficult to maintain proper staffing patterns. The nature of the university itself contributes to the problem. Faculty specialize in rather narrow scholarly areas and can't be moved around like workers on a production line. The problem is further exacerbated by the tenure system. Disciplines that are currently declining were in demand in the late 60's and early 70's and their faculties are "tenured in." Another complicating factor is affirmative action. Women and minority faculty are available in low-demand disciplines rather than in disciplines such as computer science and engineering.

Obviously, the problem of proper allocation of faculty resources is a complicated one with no easy solution. This study proposes to address only the instructional aspect of the problem. How can the faculty lines assigned by the State of Maryland to the College Park Campus be distributed most equitably among the five academic divisions? Issues of quality, affirmative action, and resources for research and public service will not be considered. What must be considered, however, is the campus' commitment to graduate education.

Traditionally, a factor in the distribution of faculty lines at UMCP has been the faculty quotient (FQ). FQ is calculated by multiplying student credit hours (SCH) at each of four levels of instruction by a weighting factor to arrive at weighted student credit hours (WSCH), and then dividing WSCH by the number of budgeted instructional full-time-equivalent faculty (FTEF) in the particular unit. The weights that have historically been used at UMCP are: lower-level undergraduate = 1.0, upper-level undergraduate = 1.5, graduate course work = 2.0, graduate research = 3.0, and practice teaching = 2.0. This calculation can be represented by the following formula:

FQ = [1.0(LLSCH) + 1.5(ULSCH) + 2.0(GCSCH) + 3.0(GRSCH) + 2.0(STSCH)] / FTEF

There are several problems with the current formula. It favors departments where large sections of introductory courses are taught and handicaps departments with a high concentration of laboratory work. Because of the slight differential in the weights, departments that teach only at the graduate level are also handicapped. As the pool of available resources shrinks and enrollment shifts among departments, colleges, and divisions, academic administrators are no longer content to "live with" the current formula. The stress created by the current disequilibrium on the campus is contributing to the willingness of administrators to abandon their simple formula and search for a new, and hopefully better, decision rule (Meisinger, 1976).

In searching for an equitable weighting scheme, one naturally turns first to the literature. A major portion of the literature relating to formulas in general, and student credit hour weights in particular, is concerned with costing and budgeting. In a broad sense, the search for a WSCH formula is a search for a modified budget formula. If faculty lines are reallocated, so is money for salaries and operating support.

Meisinger discusses the uses of state budget formulas. His discussion is no less applicable to the development and use of a formula which will result

in a more acceptable allocation or reallocation of resources among the divisions on the campus thus alleviating "role strain" (1976). Meisinger suggested that once a formula is agreed upon, competition for scarce resources will diminish. "Although there will always be an unequal distribution of resources, the inequality is more readily tolerated when open, accepted, 'objective' allocation rules are used" (Meisinger, 1976, p.8).

There are several possible approaches one can take to arrive at "objective" allocation rules. This paper will discuss three:

1. weighting schemes used at peer institutions,
2. faculty workload measures, and
3. use of a state funding formula.

Weighting Schemes Used at Peer Institutions

In order to determine whether or not UMCP's peers were using the concept of weighted credit hours, a brief survey was sent to the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) participants. There are 23 public university AAU members (including UMCP) which participate in the data exchange. Replies were received from 21 of the 22 surveyed institutions. Eight universities use weighted credit hours for some purpose; 13 do not. Table 1 displays the weighting factors reported by the AAU institutions. (Consistent with the confidentiality provision of the data exchange, institutions are coded.)

In order to determine the effects of AAU institutions' weights on UMCP faculty quotients, the weights were applied to Fall, 1981 student credit hours (Office of Institutional Studies, 1982). The resulting FQs appear in Table 2. (Fall, 1981 was selected because SCH data were available for AAU peers permitting comparative analyses to be conducted at a later time.)

Table 1: Student Credit Hour Weighting Factors Reported by AAU Institutions

	Lower Div.	Upper Div.	Grad.	Grad. Res.
Institution A	1.0	1.5	2.5	3.5
Institution B[1]	1.0	1.8	3.6	4.7
Institution C	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5
Institution D	1.0	2.0	4.0	4.0
Institution E	1.0	1.6	3.4	6.5
Institution F	1.0	2.0	4.0	4.0
Institution G[2]	1.0	1.8	4.3	6.0
	1.67	2.86	4.3	6.0
Institution H	1.0	1.7	3.92	6.06

[1]Based on average direct-cost dollars per student credit resulting from the Major Research Universities Information Exchange Project.

[2]The higher weights are used for "high-cost" programs such as architecture and engineering.

An explanation of College Park's organizational structure is in order here. The Campus is organized into five divisions. Divisions contain: 1) colleges and a school, some of which are further divided into departments; and 2) departments which are not included in a college or the school.

Examination of Table 2 reveals that the effect of the AAU weights was to produce faculty quotients ranging from about 25 percent smaller to 43 percent larger than UMCP FQs. Generally, the Division of Human and Community Resources benefited most from the higher weights and Arts and Humanities benefited least. This is primarily a result of the proportion of SCH produced at the graduate level. In Fall, 1981, 17 percent of HUCR's credit hours were produced at the graduate level, 7.5 percent of BSOS's SCH were graduate, six percent of both ALSC's and MPSE's SCH were graduate, and four percent of ARHU's SCH were produced at the graduate level. Consequently, if the campus administration wants to emphasize graduate education, it will adopt the weights used by Institutions D and F or the variable weights used by Institution G.

The adoption of another institution's weighting scheme is perhaps unlikely to meet Meisinger's qualification of objectivity. These schemes are no doubt objective when used in the university where they were developed, but when used outside that institution, they lose that objectivity for the following reasons. Some of the peers explained that their formulas were based on cost studies. It is not apparent what specific factors were considered since the methodologies employed in the various cost studies are unknown. It is highly unlikely that the results of a cost study undertaken at one university can be used appropriately at another. Nevertheless, if the administrators concerned with the selection of a formula agree on a specific scheme, Meisinger's criteria of "open" and "accepted" are met. The allocation of

Table 2: Comparison of UMCP Faculty Quotients Using UMCP and AAU Institutions' Weighting Factors

UMCP Divisions	UMCP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Agricultural and Life Sciences	281	288	324	237	338	318	338	338	327
% Difference		+ 2.5	+ 15.3	- 15.7	+ 20.3	+ 13.2	+ 20.3	+ 20.3	+ 16.4
Arts and Humanities	265	270	301	224	317	283	317	308	299
% Difference		+ 1.9	+ 13.6	- 15.5	+ 19.6	+ 6.8	+ 19.6	+ 16.2	+ 12.8
Behavioral and Social Sciences	384	395	463	299	498	434	498	479	458
% Difference		+ 2.9	+ 20.6	- 22.1	+ 29.7	+ 13.0	+ 29.7	+ 24.7	+ 19.3
Human and Community Resources	295	316	391	222	421	372	421	422	399
% Difference		+ 7.1	+ 32.5	- 24.7	+ 42.7	+ 26.1	+ 42.7	+ 43.1	+ 35.3
Mathematical and Physical Sciences and Engineering	328	336	378	277	397	365	397	465	378
% Difference		+ 2.4	+ 15.2	- 15.5	+ 21.0	+ 11.3	+ 21.0	+ 41.8	+ 15.2
MEAN FQ	311	320	369	251	392	352	392	399	369
% Difference		+ 2.9	+ 18.6	- 19.3	+ 26.0	+ 13.2	+ 26.0	+ 28.3	+ 18.6
SD	42.16	43.7	56.0	31.4	63.3	50.8	63.3	67.5	54.6

resources based on such a formula might then be "tolerated" on campus (Meisinger, 1976).

Faculty Workload Measures

If the purpose of a weighting scheme for SCH is the equitable allocation of teaching positions, an alternative method of determining this allocation is to develop a faculty workload formula and assign positions as required. There is certainly no shortage of literature on the development of faculty workload measures. Educators and administrators have been studying and measuring workload since 1919 (Yuker, 1974).

The common idea shared by all of the authors whose work on workload measurement has been reviewed is expressed in the Ohio Study:

> Clearly the conclusion of virtually all studies from 1929 to 1959 was that neither credit hour, contact hour, student credit hours or student contact hours were by themselves, or together, reliable indicators of faculty members' workloads (Yuker, 1974, p. 10).

Several authors have indicated the factors they believe should be incorporated into a faculty workload study. Class size, course level, mode of presentation, new preparation, and number of preparations are indicated by Yuker (1974). Bolton lists contact hours (taking into account preparation time and "extra" paper work), student advisees, committee memberships, administrative duties, service activities, and research and scholarly endeavors (1965). These educators did not attempt to measure the activities they thought should be considered in load studies. Perhaps they were following the advice of a university vice-president who warned in 1959:

> Any effort at quantification (of faculty load) is foredoomed to failure in a college or university unless it be fully understood that the data (to paraphrase a line from Holmes) are merely the "skin" and the living situation lies beneath its surface and that to look at an institution through the eyes of the accountant, registrar, or institutional research officer is to see through a statistical glass darkly--at least in the present state of university variabilities (Durham, 1959, p. 58).

That warning did not deter a number of investigators from attempting to quantify faculty loads in specific academic departments as well as across universities. Howell reports on the efforts of the academic vice-president, deans, and department heads at Northern Illinois University to develop a system for quantifying loads (1962). A "point schedule" was developed and used in conjunction with previously determined, but unreported, course-level weights. This "point schedule" is reproduced in Table 3 as an example of the variety of activities considered in workload studies. After calculating every faculty member's score, ". . . the normal load was defined as being a range of point scores extending one probable error on either side of the mean of the total distribution" (Howell, 1962, p. 122).

Using time charts, interviews, and other measures, Sexon (1967) developed the following workload formula:

$x + .7x + .08y =$ time per week for classroom functions (lecture hours and lab hours--contact time; lesson preparation; evaluating student work).

$x =$ contact hours per week

$.7x =$ hours spent in preparation

$y =$ number of students taught

$.08y =$ hours spent in evaluating student work

Adams modified the formula for use at Abilene Christian College and also applied Howell's point system (1976). He criticized Sexon's formula because

Table 3: Point Schedule for Staff Load

Code	Points	Aspect of Load
A	10	Each hour of undergraduate work taught
B	15	Each hour of graduate work taught
C	5	Additional points for each hour taught in Extension
D	5	Additional points for each laboratory hour taught (7 points for graduate laboratory)
E	2	Additional points for each 10 miles or fraction thereof for mileage in Extension over 80, but not more than 10 points
F	¼	For each individual enrollment over 30 in each class, not cumulative from class to class - rounded to nearest whole for total
G	5	For each 10 or fraction thereof undergraduate advisees
H	10	For each 10 or fraction thereof graduate advisees
I	3	For each individual enrolled for independent study (private lessons in music: 3 points per individual for ½ hour course, 5 points for 1 hour course)
J	5	Each graduate paper currently directed
K	10	Each hour of released time for whatever purpose
L	2-8	For membership on each University committee
M	10	For each University committee chairmanship held (standing committees only)
N	2-10	For holding office in a state or national organization
O	10	For each additional preparation beyond 3 (Except for activity courses where 3 points are assigned)

*There is no duplication if time is released for committee work or because of state or national offices held. Points are assigned for the released time and not for the committee work.

Source: Howell, C. E., "A Concept of the Measurement of Faculty Load."

it doesn't account for other "institutional duties" of the faculty member as Howell's scheme does.

In their attempt to ". . .include a complete set of factors which could be used to describe the total teaching experience. . .," Hilst and McFee developed a model with 11 variables and 21 constants (1975, p. 1). The factors included, but were not limited to, contact hours, mode of instruction, class size, masters and doctoral candidates supervised, and students advised. Two formulas were used to calculate each faculty member's load. One formula was applied to each course taught and one formula was used to calculate the value of other faculty activities. The result of the two formulas was expressed in terms of full-time teaching equivalents. When reported in 1975, the model was in use in Purdue University's School of Agriculture.

Although only three examples of faculty workload formulas have been discussed here, it becomes evident that such schemes have several common attributes. With the exception of Sexon's, each formula requires data not normally found in an institution's data base. Using these models required a data-collection effort which may not be too difficult or expensive at the department or college levels, but requires tremendous effort and valuable resources if conducted at the institutional level. Furthermore, most faculty resist the idea of workload analysis. "Some resent the concept. Others, realizing that efforts toward quality teaching (for example) do not show, worry about 'inequities'" (Eagleton, 1977, p. 133).

Each of the formulas also required either considerable research, as Sexon's did, or the involvement, over a period of time, of administrators and faculty to develop the values that are used to weight various activities. Finding factors and weights on which there is near-universal agreement in a university community is probably next to impossible. Finding faculty and

administrators who are willing to spend the time required by such a process would also approach the impossible. If the formula factors are not accepted university-wide, the model will not be useful for resource allocation since, to use Meisinger's term, it will not reduce uncertainty. Consequently, while faculty workload formulas might work within a department or even a college, they do not appear to be practical for a complex university.

Use of a State Funding Formula

Another source of weighting factors for student credit hours is state budget formulas. The Maryland State Board for Higher Education (SBHE) reported in 1981 that 29 states used formula budgets (1981). The budget guidelines developed by SBHE are used to make recommendations for funding to the Governor. The guidelines for the instructional program were based on cost studies conducted across all public four-year institutions in the state. The study resulted in funding factors (expressed in dollars) for each of four instructional methods and four levels of instruction (SBHE, 1982). Since 69 percent of instructional costs are staff compensation (Bowen, 1981), it is not unreasonable to convert the SBHE's instructional guidelines into weighting factors. Table 4 displays these factors. In addition to differentiating by course level, these guidelines differentiate by method of instruction. They, therefore, satisfy those critics of the current weighting system who would like to see laboratory instruction given a higher weight.

The derived SBHE weights were applied to UMCP's Fall, 1981 SCH and faculty quotients were calculated by division. Table 5 shows the results of the calculations. Table 6 compares Fall, 1981 UMCP faculty quotients with those generated using the SBHE guidelines.

Application of the SBHE guidelines has the greatest impact on HUCR, increasing that FQ by 400 percent. This unusually high increase is an indicator

Table 4: SBHE Instructional Program Budget Guidelines*

Instruction Method	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate	Graduate Research
Low	1.0	3.0	6.0	8.0
Area Studies Business Computer Science Interdisciplinary Studies				
Medium-Low	1.5	4.5	9.0	12.0
Agriculture Communication Foreign Language Health Home Economics Letters Mathematics Psychology Social Science				
Medium-High	2.0	6.0	12.0	16.0
Biology Education Engineering Fine Arts Physical Sciences				
High	2.5	7.5	15.0	20.0
Architecture Library Science				

*Cost per credit hour has been converted to a weighting factor.

Source: FY 1984 SBHE Consolidated Capital and Operating Budget for Higher Education. Maryland State Board for Higher Education, November, 1982, p. 29.

Table 5: WSCH and Faculty Quotients by Division Based on SBHE Guidelines

	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate	Graduate Research	FTEF	FQ
ALSC						
Medium-Low	10,000	29,678	8,343	3,768	47.5	
Medium-High	60,480	54,396	19,440	12,080	190.9	
Total	70,480	84,074	27,783	15,848	238.4	831.3
ARHU						
Low	2,841	3,069	900	456	10.1	
Medium-Low	82,602	117,112	22,023	7,296	355.4	
Medium-High	20,152	27,810	10,380	2,128	106.4	
High	3,365	19,778	4,635	-	21.5	
Total	108,960	167,769	37,938	9,880	493.4	657.8
BSOS						
Low	8,121	63,063	21,744	688	101.6	
Medium-Low	59,337	167,139	36,216	10,296	272.4	
Total	67,458	230,202	57,960	10,984	374.0	980.2
HUCR						
Medium-Low	11,466	33,597	6,255	1,560	63.9	
Medium-High	28,000	147,570	117,396	23,184	254.3	
High	-	1,958	27,960	100	19.4	
Total	39,566	183,125	151,611	24,844	337.6	1182.3
MPSE						
Low	5,947	14,109	3,414	1,048	33.0	
Medium-Low	54,262	14,729	6,696	1,236	126.8	
Medium-High	48,762	137,340	45,780	13,920	225.6	
Total	108,971	166,178	55,890	16,204	385.4	901.0

Table 6: Comparison of Faculty Quotients UMCP and SBHE

	UMCP	SBHE	Percent Change
ALSC	281	831	195.7
ARHU	265	658	148.3
BSOS	384	980	155.2
HUCR	295	1,182	300.7
MPSE	328	901	174.7

of one of the problems with the guidelines; specifically, they were developed using historical cost data. Low enrollments and high numbers of tenured faculty result in the classification of education as medium-high cost, thus giving SCH in this discipline high weights. Because of high enrollments and inadequate staff and support funds, computer science is classified as a low-cost discipline. (Computer costs are not included in the costs of computer science either, contributing further to its low-cost classification.)

Since the methodology used to conduct the cost study isn't apparent, the resulting factors should not be used for internal campus allocation decisions. Generally, state formulas are not appropriate vehicles for campus internal allocations but this restriction is sometimes ignored by state officials reviewing budgets (Schmidtlein and Glenny, 1977). Additionally, the study included all public four-year institutions. While it is not suggested that UMCP use the SBHE guidelines, a cost study would be another approach to determining weighting factors. A disadvantage of using the results of a cost study to develop weighting factors is that over- or under-staffing in departments and/or divisions would skew the results. This could be overcome by using "required" costs in those areas where understaffing is apparent. A cost analysis by department would appear then to be an objective way to arrive at equitable weights for student credit hours. To be of most benefit, such a study should be conducted periodically and the weighting factors adjusted as required.

Summary

This paper has discussed the weighting of student credit hours as it relates to the allocation of faculty positions and, therefore, other resources, to academic units within the university. It has suggested three possible methods of achieving an equitable weighting scheme: adopting weights used by

a peer institution, deriving weights from a faculty workload analysis, and developing weights from a cost study, such as that done by SBHE.

Each method has some advantages and disadvantages. Use of a faculty activity analysis or a cost study would entail the collection and analysis of a large amount of data and there is no guarantee that these results would be acceptable to the campus community. While the use of peer weights would not require the effort and resources for implementation that the other methods require, the selection of any set of weights would be arbitrary and thus subject to criticism. As with any mathematical model, none of these formulas accounts for all the variables relevant to particular decisions.

As was pointed out at the beginning of this paper, "quality" has not been considered in presenting these options. Yet it is important that consideration be given to quality aspects of programs when resource allocation decisions are being made. Not to consider ". . . such variables is to be in danger of making the assumptions that more means better and that institutions . . . can afford to continue their provision of education in similar ways as they have done in the past" (Johnstone, 1974, p. 193). Considerable effort has been expended to develop a list of "quality indicators" at College Park. The integration of such data is another important step in the decision-making process concerning resource allocation.

Obviously, decisions concerning the distribution of faculty lines and concomitant support funds cannot reasonably be based totally on the number of weighted student credit hours. In addition to quality, consideration must be given to a number of other variables such as the number of tenured faculty, affirmative action requirements, availability of "star" faculty, planned future needs, internal and external political considerations, and faculty retirements. These are the most obvious variables. Perhaps the most critical variables are the experience, intuition, and judgment of the decision maker.

No formula can replace or incorporate the critical element of good judgment borne from years of academic and administrative experience (McNamara, 1971).

Limitations of the Use of Formulas

The limitations of formulas for distributing faculty lines, and associated support funds, result from their failure to account for all variables relevant to such decisions. All relevant variables cannot be included because:

--some variables are hard to identify and the relationships among complex sets of variables are often obscure and hard to calculate,

--data are not readily available on some variables and data systems are expensive to develop and maintain, and

--many variables are hard to quantify.

Nevertheless, one has to start at some point in making allocation decisions. A common use of formulas is generating a consistent set of data on organizational units. These data then serve as a point of departure for professional judgments that can allow for the affects of additional variables not incorporated into the formula. Departments and divisions are stimulated to identify ways in which the formula fails to recognize adequately their needs. A comparative analysis of these claims across units helps one to note legitimate departures from the formula "norm", provides a rationale for why particular allocations which are greater or lesser than the formula norm are appropriate, and provides a frame of reference for evaluating allocations from year to year. A balance is maintained between an overly rigid adherance to a particular formula and an equally ill-advised overly informal method of allocation which results in unrelated, poorly rationalized, ad hoc decisions.

Conclusion

The equitable allocation of faculty positions is indeed a complicated and continuing problem with no simple solution. If the method used for making the allocation is based on sound research, the results are likely to be suffered somewhat more kindly. The risks inherent in the adoption of any new system, particularly one concerning funding, were well understood by Machiavelli. He described them in The Prince:

> There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things, because the innovator has for enemies all those who have done well under the old conditions and lukewarm defenders in those who may do well under the new.

Epilogue

The foregoing paper was presented to the Planning Council at College Park in Spring, 1983. The Council had been discussing a new weighting scheme for several months, and asked the Office of Institutional Studies to investigate alternate schemes. The results of that investigation appear in this paper. After doing considerable research, the author concluded that the method used for determining weights was actually more important than the weights themselves. It was suggested, therefore, that weights derived from empirical research would serve the campus far better than weights selected arbitrarily.

It is a well know fact that administrators don't always follow the advice of their institutional research officers. The Planning Council at College Park, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, decided to select new weights on the basis of peer data. So, employing the time-honored method of "joint wisdom", the Council adopted weights of 1.0 for

lower level undergraduate instruction, 2.0 for upper level, 3.5 for graduate, and 5.0 for graduate research. The weights are not as high as the highest peer weights, but they're close. They also bear some resemblance to the SBHE weights for low-cost disciplines.

Application of the revised UMCP weighting factors to the Fall 1981 student credit hours resulted in the faculty quotients shown in Table 7. The division which benefits most from the revised weights is Human and Community Resources. This division, which contains, among others, the Colleges of Education and Human Ecology, has been experiencing serious enrollment declines as well as faculty line reductions. On the other hand, the revised FQ for the Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences and Engineering increased at only about half the rate HUCR's FQ increased. MPSE is currently experiencing significant enrollment growth and is in serious need of additional faculty lines as well as other resources.

It is apparent to this author that the revised weighting scheme is not likely to solve any problems. It is not "objective" as defined by Meisinger. While it does support the increased emphasis on graduate education, it does not take into account laboratory and technical needs. It does not determine the needs of a department or division, independent of historical trends. Being an incremental/remedial approach, as described by Schmidtlein (1974), the effects of the plan will be discovered only after the plan has been implemented. Therefore, this institutional researcher predicts that the Campus will soon be searching again for a more acceptable allocation scheme.

Table 7: Comparison of Faculty Quotients Calculated Using Standard and Revised Weighting Factors

Division	Faculty Quotients Standard	Revised	Percent Change
Agricultural and Life Sciences	281	337	19.9
Arts and Humanities	265	315	18.9
Behavioral and Social Sciences	384	491	27.9
Human and Community Resources	295	407	38.1
Mathematical and Physical Sciences and Engineering	328	394	20.1

Bibliography

Adams, W.H. "Faculty Load." Improving College and University Teaching. 1976, 24, 215-216, 218.

Bolton, D.L. "Measuring Faculty Load." Improving College and University Teaching, 1965, 13, 157-158.

Bowen, H.R. The Costs of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The More Effective Use of Resources. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.

Durham, G.H. "The Uses and Abuses of Faculty Load Data." In K. Bunnell (Ed.), Faculty Work Load. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960, 12-16.

Eagleton, L.C. "Faculty Workload Measurement at Penn State." Chemical Engineering Education, Summer 1977, 7(3), 130-134.

Hilst, A.R. and McFee, W.W. "Quantifying Teacher Loads." Journal of Agronomic Education, 1975(4), 1-4.

Howell, C.E. "A Concept of the Measurement of Faculty Load." The Journal of Experimental Education, 1962, 31, 121-128.

Johnstone, J.N. "Mathematical Models Developed for Use in Educational Planning: A Review." Review of Educational Research, 1974, 44(2), 177-201.

McNamara, J.F. "Mathematical Programming Models in Educational Planning." Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41(5), 419-446.

Meisinger, R.J., Jr. State Budgeting for Higher Education: The Use of Formulas, Berkeley: Center for Research and Deveopment in Higher Education, University of California, 1976.

Office of Institutional Studies, University of Maryland, College Park Campus. Instructional Load Comparisons, 1973-74 through 1982-83. November 1982.

Schmidtlein, F.A. and Glenny, L.A. State Budgeting for Higher Education: The Political Economy of the Process, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1977.

Sexon, J.E. "Method for Computing Faculty Load." Improving College and University Teaching, 1967, 15:219-222.

State Board for Higher Education. FY 84 SBHE Consolidated Capital and Operating Budget for Higher Education. Annapolis, Md., November, 1982.

State Board for Higher Education. Use of Budget Guidelines Among the States. Annapolis, Md., June 1981.

Yuker, H.E. Faculty Workload: Facts, Myths and Commentary. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974.